



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XIX, I.

WHOLE NO. 73.

I.—THE BHĀRATA AND THE GREAT BHĀRATA.

Two years ago I received from the editor of this Journal Dahlmann's *Mahābhārata*, and it was my intention to write at once a review of that noteworthy book. I soon found, however, that an ordinary review would neither do the book justice nor satisfy myself. But at that time new cares and subsequently a journey to India prevented me from writing a full account and criticism of Dahlmann's theory, which is, in short, that the great epic was composed not as an epic, but as a moral and religious encyclopedia. There was, moreover, something so incongruous in the conception of the epic as a manual of good advice that, as I am ashamed to confess, while climbing over the ruins of Indrapat and wandering about the Kurus' sacred plain, *das Mahābhārata als Rechtsbuch* was wellnigh forgotten in the *Mahābhārata als Epos*.

Such sentimentality (as if one must believe in Homer because he has found Troy) quickly passed away, however, as I returned from the place where the bones of those that had died in the *Mahābhārata* war were still shown piled in heaps more than a thousand years ago,¹ and after diligent search, with the help of those who had kept *au courant* with the last year's progress in thought, discovered that what I had neglected to do had been

¹The bones of some thirty thousand warriors with crushed skulls, evidently fallen in battle and belonging to a race that inhabited this country before the Indians, are still exhibited on one forgotten battlefield in the West. How long such heaps of bones could remain (if cared for) in Kurukṣetra I cannot say. They were seen by the pious Chinese pilgrim in the seventh century. But perhaps they were not Bhārata bones after all!

most ably accomplished by others. Every Sanskrit scholar is to-day familiar with the learned reviews which Dahlmann's book has called forth in the last twelvemonth, and it seems almost a work of supererogation to attempt to say anything new after what has been so fully discussed by Barth, Jacobi, Jolly, Ludwig, Schroeder, Winternitz, and possibly by others whose critiques I may not have seen.¹

In the following pages, therefore, I shall not attempt to review Dahlmann's work in detail. It is a long, interesting, and in many particulars instructive attempt to prove that the epic was written essentially as it has come down to us and that it dates from *circa* 500 B. C. I will content myself with analyzing its *πρῶτον ψεύδος* in a few words.

That the Bhārata epic was enough of an epic to be compared with the Greek epics is rendered probable by the fact that the Greek visitors to India reported that the Hindus had a sort of epic poetry, tales of 'Homeric' heroes. That there were two versions of the Bhārata story is proved by the fact that the Hindus themselves cited "the Bhārata and the Mahā-Bhārata," that is, the (little) and big Bhārata. There was then (two or three centuries B. C.) a big Bhārata. Are we to suppose that it arose independently of the Bhārata or grew out of the latter? In the latter, certainly more probable, event, is there any reason to suppose that the big Bhārata stopped growing bigger as the years went on?

In an article published in 1883 in the Journal of the American Oriental Society I compared the professed quotations from Manu found in the epic with the extant work of Manu, and showed that if we put the great didactic masses of the Mahābhārata into one group and the rest of this literary megatherium into another, then the *ipse dixit* verses cited from Manu in the first group correspond with extant Manu verses much more closely than do the verses in the second group; and that in the last great didactic book the proved citations are vastly more numerous. Thence I drew what seemed to me the reasonable conclusion, that the didactic masses were composed after our present Manu was in its present shape, whereas this could not have been the case with the

¹ Barth, Journal des Savants, April-July, 1897; Jacobi, GGA. 1896, pp. 67-78; Jolly, Ind. Ant. XXV, p. 343; Ludwig, now as brochure; Schroeder, WZKM. X, pp. 75-9; Winternitz, JRAS. 1897, pp. 713-59. The last review has not yet, at this writing, Dec. 1897, been completed.

second group. These didactic masses are grouped in their greatest extent in books twelve and thirteen. In the first eleven books I found only two quotations that could be verified in our present Manu text, against six unverified; in the twelfth book eight verified and seven unverified; in the thirteenth, seven verified and only three unverified. Whether these facts point to the conclusion I drew or not, they certainly show a difference in the relation of Manu and the different massed portions of the epic, which in turn indicates a difference in age between these portions.

Whether the Mahābhārata is to be regarded as having originally been epic or didactic depends entirely on its original portions. Granted that it was composed in its present shape, the didactic tone is so overpowering that I could quarrel with no one who asserted that such a book was not an epic. But I should still inquire with wonder what man was ever poet enough to write the gambling-scene and dull enough at the same time to write the Anuśāsa; what didactic priest was ever so muddle-headed as to teach that the receipt of gifts even from a good king was sinful and even from a bad king laudatory, that asceticism was pure folly and that again it was the highest virtue, that polyandry was an abhorrent thing and yet the practice of his model heroes; further, why tens of thousands of verses should be devoted to battle-scenes for the most part idle to the author's purpose and occasionally exhibiting his heroes in anything but a model light; and lastly, why a pedagogue who wrote 500 B. C. indulged at the same time in the grossest Puranic abuse of grammar in those portions of the epic which I had supposed to be late, and wrote so decent Sanskrit in the portions which I had hitherto supposed belonged to an older epoch.¹ To these questions I find no answer in Dahlmann's theory. But I would ask one more. Does

¹ Compare the late (?) verse xi. 26. 5, where *dhatta* is used for *dhatte*; *svasām* in the late (?) scene of the sixth book, 116. 3 (in PW. under *svasā*, but there is only *svasām*, as late as *duhitām*, wherever either of the forms occurs); *duhitām* in the late (?) fourth book, 72. 4; *dātum* with the accusative of the person to whom is given, in a didactic chapter (*na utsahate vīttarakṣi dātum mahājanān*), xii. 321. 143; the dative and locative for the possessive genitive in the theological chapter, xiii. 14. 1 ff., "a barbarous construction never found in the old portions of the Mahābhārata" (Holtzmann); the accusative of respect in xiii. 62. 30 (*yathā dhāvati gaur vatsam evam bhūmir bhavati bhūmidam*); the use of *yaj* as 'give to priests' in xiii. 31. 10 (PW. 'ksitā' to change to Bombay reading), *yajanti kṣitīm*; *tān* for neuter plural, xiii. 68. 29; etc., etc.

Dahlmann believe the Mahābhārata to have been struck off before or after the therein-mentioned eighteen Purāṇas? Before, of course, and the author would perhaps retort that I myself long since pointed out that the eighteen Purāṇas are mentioned only in one text. But exactly in the discrepancy of texts lies much that is corrective of the Dahlmannian delirament.

Some passages, like the one just mentioned, have indisputably been added to the original text. It was not all spouted forth at once. It remains, then, to discover whether any one part may on reasonable historical grounds be regarded as later than any other.

Let us take the fourth book. The heroes are dressed up as eunuchs, cooks, and servitors, and play pranks in Virāṭa's palace. Between the grimness of the gambling-scene and the fierceness of the battle, this episode stands like an interlude of pantomime inserted to cover a thirteenth year of exile, which in other parts of the book is not recognized. Is it of no importance that such harem-stories as are here given are found nowhere else in the epic; that only here, in laudation unparalleled elsewhere, Arjuna alone routs the whole Kuru army? But the text itself hints that the fourth book as at present composed is a late addition. There are at least two passages, as Holtzmann has pointed out, where the thirteenth year is ignored altogether, as if it were an after-thought, though in the present version of the Sabhā it is recognized. But more than that, the original stipulation even as it now stands is merely that the year shall be passed '*sajane*'—that is, in the presence of people, not in a city—and a verse alluding to the exile after it is all over distinctly states that the Pāṇḍavas passed all thirteen years as hermits in the wood:

*vanam pravrajitāścā 'sma valkalājīnavāsasaḥ
anarhamāṇās taṁ bhāvam trayodaśa samāḥ parāṇi.*¹

An echo of this still lingers in Bhīma's question at xv. 11. 23: *kva tadā Droṇaḥ . . . abhavat yatra trayodaśa samā vane vanyena jīvatha.*

Again, how stands it with the Dānadharma now known as Anuśāsana? Could any literary production be more plainly a later growth? Unknown in the Java text, first cited as 'gift-laws,' then emerging as a whole book; which is called 'The Law' because it chiefly enjoins those *agrahāra* which the earlier law

¹ vii. 197. 10. Compare ii. 74. 19; 76. 23; and for the two other references, Holtzmann, Mahābhārata, ii, p. 98; Mbh. viii. 91. 4.

condemned (for gifts of land to a priest are in early law allowed only in need or as sacrificial gifts), but which in the Anuṣāsana are extolled as always meritorious, and as fruitful of reward to him that gives and to him that receives. Here too is found the wildest excess in grammar and sectarianism.

This, however, is not the only reason for considering the Anuṣāsana as a late book. The epic itself omits it from its own first table of contents. As this table of contents is not without value for other parts of the epic, which are both regarded as late from other points of view and omitted from the list, it may be well to review its account of the epic as the latter was known when it was composed.

The introduction does not at first recognize the Amṛāvataṛaṇa (adhy. 59-64). This, among other late traits, exalts the epic as an encyclopedia of sacred lore (62. 35), which when studied through the *vasso* will purify from sin (ib. 32); a written copy being intended, as is evident from the words *yo idam bhāratam . . . vācakāya prayachati* (vs. 50). Here the size of the work is stated to be 100,000 *ślokas* (vs. 14). This ignored chapter refers to the attempt at burning the Pāṇḍavas. The sections containing the account are also ignored in the first introductory analysis, 1. 88 ff., which gives Sabhā as the parvan following Sambhava. The latter closes with parv. 140. The value of this short analysis is shown by the very character of the Jatugṛha story (parv. 141-51). But all that remains of Ādi is *extra* epic, old tales wrought in, or wild extravaganza. In this analysis the third book, as Āraṇya (that is, ten parvans of Vana), now follows in due order with Virāṭa, Udyoga, Bhīṣma, Droṇa, Karṇa, Čalya, Strī, Āiṣika (parv. 10-18 of Sāuptika), Čānti, Aṣvamedha, Ācrama, Māusala. Here, then, is a list of the books of the Mahābhārata which omits entirely the thirteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth books of the present text, Anuṣāsana, Prasthāna and Svarga. The reason can be only that when this list was made these books, like the Hari-vaṇṇa, were not parts of the epic.

The first discrepancy in the texts here occurs, just before the second list:¹

C. i. 101 ff.:

*caturviṇṣati sāhasrīm cakre bhāratasamhitām
upakhyānāir vinā tāvad bhāratam procyate budhāiḥ*

¹ This is a new *triṣṭubh* table of contents, each verse beginning with *yad ācrauṣam*.

*tato 'dhyardhaçatañ bhūyaḥ saṁkṣepaṁ kṛtavān ṛṣiḥ
anukramaṇikādhyāyaṁ vṛttāntānāṁ saparvaṇām*

It is then stated that the author made another Sāmhitā of sixty hundred thousand verses, of which only one hundred thousand are extant. B. here reads the same half-verse cited above from the (interpolated) Aṁçāvataṛaṇa :

idaṁ çatasahasraṁ hi çlokānāṁ puṇyakarmaṇām

and places it just before the description in C., but here it is given with its accompanying half:

B. i. 1. 101b, 102a :

*idaṁ çatasahasraṁ tu (ç)lokānāṁ puṇyakarmaṇām
upakhyānāñ saha jñeyam ādyaṁ bhāratam uttamam
caturviṁçati sāhasṛim, etc. (as in C.).*

That is to say, C. simply states that without the episodes the Bhārata contains 24,000 verses, and B. prefaces this with the remark that the episodes amount to seventy-six thousand verses. It had already been stated that the epic at first consisted of 24,000 + 2400 verses—that is, presumably without episodes.¹

The introduction admits that scholars of the day made the work begin with different chapters (i. 1. 52), and as this chapter at the same time alludes to the commentators :

vividhañ saṁhitājñānaṁ dīpayanti manṣiṇaḥ,

etc. (vs. 53), it is evident that the Itihāsa or Purāṇa (the epic calls itself by both names) to a certain extent recognizes its own gradual construction and that it has been at a pretty late period embellished with the final addition of a preface; not the last of its kind, however, for in the following chapters is given a new and later summary which mentions the Harivaṇça. This sum-

¹ The passage has, I think, been generally misunderstood. In i. 1. 81 it is said of the original epic: "eight thousand eight hundred verses know I; and Çuka knows (as many); and Sañjaya knows (as many) or (perhaps he does) not (know so many)." This is nothing more than the epic of twenty-four thousand referred to above. Weber, von Schroeder, Holtzmann, and others, take it to mean that there was an original epic of 8800 verses (Lit.², p. 204; Lit. u. Cult., p. 462; Mahābhārata, vol. II, p. 6). But there are only two versions, one short and one long: *vistūryāi 'tan mahaj jñānam ṛṣiḥ saṁkṣīpya cā' bravāt* (i. 1. 51). The short epic is, to be exact, $3 \times 8000 + 3 \times 800$, or (in contrast to the long epic of 100,000) 24,000 verses.

mary is immediately repeated again at greater length.¹ The secondary character of the longer analysis in the prior division is proved, if proof were needed, by the statement that some scholars do not recognize as genuine the portion before Āstika (parv. 13). As a matter of fact, the original epic began with the present second book, but some parts of the first book are probably earlier than the epic itself. These are distinct tales which now preface the great story.

In the article referred to above I showed that whereas the late thirteenth book reverses the proportion of forms quotable from Manu in the early books, the twelfth book occupied a middle position. The whole character of Çānti supports this inference to be drawn from this fact. It stands in time before Anuṣāsana, but later than the mass that precedes it in position. Nor is the text without evidence on this point.

Many of the varied readings in the epic are significant, not accidental. Some additions are to honor the Pāṇdavas; some omissions are also in their honor. Of this point I have spoken long ago, and think it needs no new illustrations. Some changes have been made, however, for minor reasons, to back up a previous alteration, to gloss over an innovation, to praise a hero, to inculcate a general moral, to change the metre, to add to the pathos of the scene. To one of these changes I invite the reader's especial attention.

The machinery by which the twelfth book is attached to the Mahābhārata is the suspension of Bhīṣma's death for a period long enough for him to utter the 'sacred law' of this book (and the next). With the prior death of Bhīṣma the sermon of Bhīṣma becomes dramatically impossible. In one passage, vii. 198. 42, the statement that Bhīṣma was slain (before he uttered 'the law') has been allowed to stand, partly because the weight of the verse was laid on the sinfulness of the act of smiting the venerable man, and partly because the environment was not such as to determine absolutely that *hato Bhīṣmaḥ* meant 'killed,' though it really can have no other meaning here. There are other cases too where Bhīṣma is thus spoken of as *hata* 'felled,' but most of them admit the same doubt that 'felled' might be not killed, but knocked over, though the epic usage is against

¹ For the Anukramaṇīparva or Anukramaṇīkādhyaṃya, see i. 1. 265 ff. The shorter description follows in 2. 30 ff.; after which comes the long Parvasaṅgraha.

such an interpretation. But where it is impossible to escape the conclusion that the words of the text meant that Bhīṣma was killed (before the Çānti was uttered), there the text has been altered. This effort is so apparent that, conversely, one not only may but must draw the inference that the twelfth book was not existent as a part of the epic; for, as it is inconceivable that the reading should have been altered so as to make Bhīṣma die first, the only possible explanation is that the text which so depicts the event was the prior one.¹

The first of these concealments is the verse omitted in C. after vii. 5648a (= 137. 34b):

*agādhābuddhir gāṅgeyaḥ kṣitāu suraguroḥ samaḥ
tyājitaḥ samare prāṇāns tasmād yuddham hi niṣṭhūram*

This is a straightforward statement to the effect that the twelfth book was not uttered and never could have been uttered by Bhīṣma. Hence it is omitted in the Bengal text (with which the C. edition coincides for the most part, judging from N.'s references to the varied readings²), but is, fortunately, preserved in B.

Not less instructive is the second instance. After vii. 6513a (= 150. 20a) C. omits:

*çayānaṁ nā 'çakam trātum bhīṣmam āyodhane hatam
tam mām anāryapuruṣaṁ mītradrūham adhārmikam*

As the preceding verses have varied readings, I give each as it stands.

¹ Whether the Çānti did exist as a separate work is another question, that lies apart from Dahlmann's theory. So in Java the Çānti as a book of *dharma* exists, but not as part of the Java epic.

² As an example, N. says of the 'GGGG' passage in B. vi. 43. 1-5: "These five and a half verses are not recognized by the Gāuḍas," and they are lacking in C. They will serve, perhaps, as an example of one of the ways in which the epic grew: *Gītāsu gītā kartavyā, kim anyāiḥ çāstrasāṅgrahāiḥ, Yā svayam padmanābhasya mukhapadmād viniṣṭā, Sarvaçāstramayī gītā, sarvadevamayo hariḥ, Sarvatīrthamayī gaṅgā, sarvavedamayo manuḥ. Gītā gaṅgā ca gāyatri govinde 'ti hr̥di sthite, Caturgākārasaṁyukte, punar janma na vidyate. Śaṭçatāni saviṣṭāni çlokānām prāha keçavaḥ, Arjunaḥ saptapañcāçat, saptaṣaṣṭīm tu saṁjayaḥ, Dhṛtarāṣṭraḥ çlokaṁ ekaṁ, gītāyā mānam ucyaṭe, Bhāratāmṛta-sarvasva-gītāyā mathitasya ca Sāram uddhṛtya kṛṣṇena arjunasya mukhe hutam.* The fragment is quite Puranic, even to the phraseology. On the greater number of later added passages N. has no note at all.

C: *katham patitavṛttasya pṛthivī suhṛdāṃ druhaḥ
vivaraṃ nā 'çakad dātum pṛthivī mama durmateḥ
yo 'yaṃ rudhīraraktākṣo rājñām madhye pītāmahaḥ
kiṃ pravakṣyati durdharṣaḥ sametya paralokajit*

B: *katham patitavṛttasya pṛthivī suhṛdāṃ druhaḥ
vivaraṃ nā 'çakad dātum mama pāṛthivasaṃsadi
yo 'ham rudhīrasiktāṅgaṃ rājñāṃ madhye pītāmaham
çayānaṃ nā 'çakaṃ trātuṃ bhīṣmam āyodhane hatam
taṃ mām anāryapuruṣaṃ mītradrūham adhārmikam
kiṃ vakṣyati hi durdharṣaḥ sametya paralokajit*

Here there can be no doubt that the miserable, ignoble man, "unable to save Bhīṣma, who was killed when lying on the field of battle," really means, in speaking of the occurrence, to say that Bhīṣma was killed before his eyes, in the scene which now begins, vi. 119. 87: *prākṣiṛāḥ prāpatad rathāt* (just before the following hocuspocus: *dhārayāmāsa ca prāṇān*). For in the next verse, vii. 150. 22, a companion piece to this, *hata* is used of another hero slain beyond peradventure. This again is followed by another verse where *nihata* has the same meaning and exchanges with *hata* in *hatāḥ çūrāḥ*. We have a long list of great heroes who have been slain in battle for the prince, and the latter says that he will offer them the usual rites: *teṣāṃ gatvā 'ham ānṛṇyam adya . . . tarpayiṣyāmi tān eva jalena yamunām anu* (vs. 25). The statement is clear and simple: All of these heroes, Bhīṣma and the others, have died for me, I will therefore perform pacificatory rites for them, especially in the case of Bhīṣma, from whom I fear reproaches when I meet him in the next world, for he has gained heaven, *paralokajit*. So Droṇa says in reply: *Çikhaṇḍy avadhīd Bhīṣmam . . . avadhyaṃ nihataṃ drṣṭvā saṃjuge*, 151. 7; *yatrā 'paçyaṃ hatāṃ Bhīṣmaṃ paçyatas te*, 31.¹

¹ Compare vi. 120. 20 ff., *hata* of Bhīṣma; 120. 3, *adyāham pītarāṃ çrutvā nihataṃ*; 4, *çrutvā vinihataṃ Bhīṣmam*; 6, *na mṛṣyāmi hataṃ raṇe*; 7, *hato drūpadeyena*; 119. 114, *avadhye hate bhīṣme*. That *hata* means slain in the ordinary usage of the epic may clearly be seen at vii. 166. 33, where, when a hero is wounded and faints, the foes *hatam sma menire sarve* 'all thought him dead'; ib. 59, *tato bhīmo hatam matvā tava putram* 'thinking him dead.' Compare also the famous *açvatthāmā hata iti*, vii. 190. 16; and vii. 178. 31-40, where *hata*, *nihata* and *vinihata* are successively used as synonyms to describe the condition of a decapitated creature, dead beyond doubt. So vii. 179. 61, where *hata* is *gatāsu* 'expired,' in 62, and *nihata* in 63; vii. 172. 3, etc.

The many references to Bhīṣma 'felled' and this attempt to suppress the fact of death, when most clearly stated, hang together. The original version stated frankly that Bhīṣma was killed, and the implication is as strong as one could wish that, in the absence of the narrator, there was no such epic narrative as now piles up the agony of preaching in *Çānti*.

From historical evidence based on the condition of the texts in Java, and on the statements of the text itself as shown above, the conclusion that the present epic was not thrown out as one work is irresistible. There is no argument from *realien*, compared with other *realien* in texts of doubtful age, to combat this conclusion. The epic consisted first of the epic: *Sabhā*, *Āraṇya*, *Udyoga*, *Bhīṣma*, *Droṇa*, *Karṇa*, *Çalya*, *Strī*, *Sāuptika*, *Açvamedha*, *Āçrama*, *Māusala*. After this were added the *Ādi* preface, *Virāṭa*, and *Çānti*. After these (after the first analysis) were added *Anuçāsana*, then *Prasthāna*, *Svarga*, the *Harivaṇça* (mentioned in *Ādi* and *Svarga*), and *Ādi* tales and latest tables.

But there is still much that can be deducted, now included in the earlier books, for when I say that *Droṇa* existed in the first version, I mean a *Droṇa*, not the *Droṇa* of to-day. Few scholars will venture to deny that passages have been added, that the vain repetitions of the battle-scenes were not all there at first. But because it is difficult to say just what portions are late in every instance, I see no reason to sneer at the general critical attitude of those who would make distinctions between late and early. The question of exact dates is of no moment. Whether the *Mahābhārata* was completed in its present form in the centuries preceding or following our era is a secondary question, and 'early' and 'late' are of course only relative terms. For the history of the text, the interrelation of the parts is the one important problem. The fact that the most vicious masses of didactic fungus are really fungus and not the radical part of the tree is of more value than the date of the planting of the tree.

In this chief concern the varied readings help us considerably. The reference to the *Purāṇas* shows how late an addition may be. The interpolated exploit of an otherwise unknown hero shows us how the epic probably was expanded in cases no longer so easily controlled. As specimens of this form of critique, which, with all respect for Dahlmann's ingenious work, I cannot but feel should precede such theories as he has put forth, I give herewith a few notable passages of the epic.

Late texts have few variations. So the Çiva episode in vii. 80 ff. is smoothly uniform. So too the short final books, xvi, xvii, xviii, show little variation not only in our editions, but in the MSS inspected by Burnell, who says also that the episodes agree very closely in the MSS. In accordance with this statement stands the fact that the printed editions show least variation, per mass, in the episodic third book, and that of all the books, with the exception of the final short books, the twelfth and thirteenth agree most perfectly. In these two, which are of the greatest importance, there is not a single variation to compare with those in the long battle-books. In the latter the two texts sometimes differ in extent by passages of a dozen or more verses; in the former there is only the occasional omission in one text of a half verse, or at most one verse, found in the other. So, too, in the fourth book the variations are few, of no length, and unimportant.

Very instructive, on account of the different character of the different parts, is the first book. Here every important omission or addition is directly connected with the history of the heroes. The many portions which lie apart from the heroes are quite smooth and show little variation. But the passages where occur important variations are: 1) four and a half verses, in the account of Bhīṣma's marriage; 2) in the account of the poisoning of the Pāṇḍavas; 3) in the account of Arjuna at Maṇipūr; 4) in the story of Agni burning Khāṇḍava at the place where Arjuna's assistance (as an incorporate divine seer) is narrated.

The second of these cases is as follows: B. omits i. 5066c and C. omits i. 129. 36-9, 43b, while 40-3a are placed at 5068-70. Thus the two versions are:

C. 5065 ff.:

*tato yudhiṣṭhiro rājā bhīmam āha vaco 'rthavat
tūṣṇim bhava na te jalpam idam kāryaṁ kathaṅcana
itaḥ prabhṛti kāunteyā rakṣatā 'nyonyam ādṛtāḥ
evam uktvā mahābāhur dharmarājo yudhiṣṭhirah
bhrātṛbhiḥ sahitaḥ sarvair apramatto 'bhavat tadā
kumārān krīḍamānāḥ tān dṛṣṭvā rājā ca durmadān
evam duryodhanaḥ karṇaḥ śakuniṣcā 'pi sāubalaḥ
anekair abhyupāyais tān jighāṁsanti sma pāṇḍavān
pāṇḍavā api tat sarvaṁ pratyaajānann amarṣitāḥ
udbhāvanam akurvanto vidurasya mate sthitāḥ
gurvaṁ śikṣārtham anviṣya gāutame tān nyavedayat
ṣarastambe samudbhūtaṁ vedaṣāstrārthapāragam*

B. omits the third line (*itaḥ*, etc.; also reading *jalpyam* in the second line), has the two following lines (*evam . . . tadā* = 35), transposes the next line, and after 35 inserts all that here follows :

*sārathīm cā 'sya dayitam apahastena jaghnivān
dharmātmā viduras teṣāṁ pārthānāṁ pradadāu matim
bhojane bhīmasenasya punaḥ prākṣepayad viṣam
kālakūṭaṁ navaṁ tikṣṇaṁ saṁbhṛtaṁ lomaharṣaṇam
vāiṣyāputras tadā 'caṣṭa pārthānāṁ hitakāmyayā
tac cā 'pi bhuktvā 'jarayad avikāraṁ vṛkodaraḥ
vikāraṁ na hy ajanayat sulikṣṇam api tad viṣam
bhīmasaṁhanane bhīme ajiryata vṛkodare
evam duryodhanaḥ karṇaḥ . . . vidurasya mate sthitāḥ
kumārān kṛṣṇamānāṁ tān drṣṭvā rājā 'tidurmadān
guruṁ cikṣārtham anviṣya gāutamaṁ tān nyavedayat
garastambe, etc.*

The first attempt to poison Bhīma is told in 128. 45 ff. This second attempt is not commented upon by N. All the verses describing the act are omitted in C. Both are very faulty texts. The unintelligible first line in B., *sārathīm cā 'sya*, etc., appears to have dropped into this passage from iii. 12. 85 = 545. In the latter passage, however, only one poisoning is referred to and that immediately before Bhīma is flung into the river, whence Bhīma rose and *sarvān sarpān apothayat sārathīm ca*, etc. (compare i. 128. 59: *pothayāmāsa tān sarvān [sarpān]*, etc.). In this retrospect from the third book the verses alluding to the one and only attempt are *yo (duryodhanaḥ) bhojane bhīmasenasya pāpāḥ prākṣepayad viṣam kālakūṭam* (etc., to) *lomaharṣaṇam taj jṛṇam avikāreṇa sahānnena janārdana*, after which follows the attempt to drown (iii. 12. 80 ff.).

I cite this as an interesting example both of the way in which the epic was added to and of the plastic style and loose connection in epic verses. It is perfectly clear that the second poison scene in i. 129 is made out of the first (i. 128) combined with recollections of the account given in retrospect in iii. 12, with the deliberate substitution to this end of *punaḥ* for *pāpāḥ* (after *pāpāḥ* in i. 128. 45: *tato duryodhanaḥ pāpas tad bhāikṣye kālakūṭakam Viṣaṁ prakṣepayām āsa*).

The scene with Citrāṅgadā is too long to cite, but may be indicated by the fact that B. adds ten verses on Arjuna's son (as a putrikā's *ṣulka*) and his wife's coming to visit him. B. i. 217.

24b¹ = C. i. 7884b¹ and B. 34b² = C. 7884b². B. adds 24b²-34b¹ and 35.

There is nothing in the portions of Ādi not connected with the Pāṇḍavas, nothing in Vana, long as it is, nothing in any book after the battle-books to compare with these variations. In the battle-books, however, the variations are even more violent. Here some of the scenes are quite unrecognizable in their alternate form. It must be of these books that Burnell says, speaking of the "longer books," that "they differ to as great an extent as the two chief recensions of the Rāmāyaṇa," for, as I remarked above, Čānti has no extensive variations.

In Bhīṣma, where the fighting begins, there is one long passage (parv. 47-9) where two verses of C. (1850 ff.) make ten and a half verses in B. (47. 43 ff.), in honor of an otherwise inconspicuous hero. This passage is followed by a 'tumult' scene, full of varied readings and having six added verses in B. This is followed again by some new verses in honor of the same new hero; then, after several varied readings, in the next chapter B. has six more added verses, and the whole passage is so bad even in one text that (at 47. 43) even the native commentator says that it is "clearly interpolated" (*prakṣipta iti bhāti*). This introduction of unknown or unimportant heroes is by no means uncommon, as in B. vi. 79. 22-3 (omitted in C. after 3470).

In the battle-books old and new are preserved together. The reason for omission and expansion is often only to honor a hero or remove a crime. Thus viii. 9. 50b-52a, where Arjuna is charged with avoiding Karna in battle, is quietly omitted in C. (after 300a); and after vii. 1296 (= 29. 43) appear in B. three and a half verses in which Kṛṣṇa advises Arjuna to shoot away Bhagadatta's band, which the old man tied up his eye-lids with (*unmīlanārthāya baddhapatṭaḥ*), and so blind him that he might slay him. These C. omits.

I give a few examples of these variants.

C. omits vii. 70. 7-8 (after 2432):

*dantān bhaṅktvā sahasrasya karṇān nāsā nyakṛntata
tataḥ saptaśahasrāṇām kaṭudhūpam apāyayat
ṣiṣṭān baddhvā ca hatvā vāi teṣāṃ mūrdhni vibhidya ca
guṇāvatiṃ (sic) uttareṇa khāṇḍavād dakṣiṇena ca
giryante śatasāhasrā hāihayāḥ samare hatāḥ*

Just as B. vii. 61. 4-5, 6b-7 are added in glory of Dilipa and vii.

63. 4 is added in glory of Nāhuṣa, so here in the tale of Rāma five half verses are put in to magnify the horror of his greatness by an additional account of atrocities committed by him. C. reads in the hemistich preceding: *udbandhanāt sahasraṁ tu hāihayāḥ samare hatāḥ* 'a thousand Haihayas were slain by hanging.' The account is then expanded, though previously in both versions stands a list of general slaughterings; to which list B. adds the details given above, takes the last words of the original and tacks them on at the end, changing the words just preceding to *udbandhanāt sahasraṁ ca sahasraṁ udake dhṛtam*. The late character of this Rāma tale (one of the sixteen tales of old kings found again in Čānti) is shown by the mention in vs. 15 of the *eighteen* islands (*sarvān aṣṭādaśa dvīpān vaçam āniya*).

Another geographical statement is made in B. iii. 254. 7a (after C. 15242b):

Nepāla-viṣaye ye ca rājānas tām avājayat

C. omits and N. is silent. It would be interesting to know whether this allusion to the 'kings of Nepal' is included in the epic of 500 B. C. But it is a very palpable interpolation, for just before it Karṇa "ascended the great mountain (Čāila) Himavat, and conquered the Hāimavatikas," or inhabitants of the Čāila, and just after it he "descended from the Čāila (which must be the same Himālayas) and struck into the eastern district of Bengal" (Aṅgas, Vaṅgas, Kalingas, Čuṇḍikas, Mithilas, Māga-dhas, Karkakhaṇḍas).¹

A typical case of slight expansion in the case of the Pāṇḍavas occurs in B. i. 155. 41-4 (after 6081). N. comments on all the verses 37-40 preceding and 45-6 following, where the chapter ends; but he says nothing of this passage, which is not a necessary part of the text. Its omission in C. is noteworthy because of the allusion to Rāvaṇa, Indrajit, and Hanuman:

*ghaṭotkaco mahākāyaḥ pāṇḍavān prthayā saha
abhi-vādya yathānyāyam abravīc ca prabhāṣyatām
kiṁ karomy aham āryāṇāṁ nīḥṣaṇkaṁ vadatā 'naghāḥ
taṁ bruvautāṁ bhāimaseniṁ kuntī vacanam abravīt
tvāṁ kurūṇāṁ kule jātaḥ sāksād bhīmasamo hy asi
jyesthah putro 'si pañcānāṁ sāvāyāṁ kuru putraka*

¹ For Čuṇḍikān C. reads Maṇḍikān. Both texts have *niveçya viṣaye 'tmanah*. There are too many such cases, where *ā* is elided after *e*, to admit that Vedic *tman* is here intended.

*pr̥thayā 'py evam uktas tu praṇamyāi 'va vaco 'bravīt
yathā hi rāvaṇo loke indrajic ca mahābalaḥ
varṣmavīryasamo loke viṣiṣṭaḥ cā 'bhavan nṛṣu*
[45: *kṛtyakāla upasthāsye pitṛn iti ghaṭotkacāḥ
āmantrya rakṣasān cṛeṣṭhaḥ pratasthe co'ttarām diṣam*]

One of the most curious expansions I have referred to above. It occurs in B. i. 224. 3b-7a, between the two half-verses of C. 8159, which latter reads:

*upāyaḥ paridr̥sto me yathā tvaṁ dhakṣyase 'nagha
khāṇḍavaṁ dāvam adyāiva miṣato 'sya ṣaciṣateḥ*

The situation is this: Agni has the stomach-ache and wants to be cured at once. The original gives him instant (*adyāiva*) relief. The clumsy insertion makes him wait a long time for the birth of the divine sages as Arjuna and Kṛṣṇa:

*[upāyaḥ paridr̥sto me yathā tvaṁ dhakṣyase 'nagha]
kālaṁ ca kañcit kṣamatām tatas tvām vakṣyate 'nala
bhaviṣyataḥ sahāyāu te naranārāyaṇāu tadā
tābhyām tvaṁ sahito dāvaṁ dhakṣyase havyavāhana
evam astu iti taṁ vahnir brahmāṇāṁ pratyabhāṣata
saṁbhūtāu tāu vīditvā tu naranārāyaṇāv ṛṣi
kālasya mahato rājañs tasya vākyaṁ svayambhuvaḥ
anusmṛtya jagāmā'tha punar eva pītāmaham
abravīt ca tadā brahmā yathā tvaṁ dhakṣyase 'nala
[khāṇḍavaṁ dāvam adyāiva, etc.]*

The interpolation is not commented upon by N. As the identity of the heroes with the seers is anyway admitted in what follows at once in both texts (B., vs. 8), the object of the expansion is apparently to lead up to this identity, and at the same time to correlate the story with the statement in 223. 16, that this is an "ancient tale" which had to be brought up to date by delaying the action.

Additions in honor of Kṛṣṇa begin in the fifth book. Thus, after 1877 C. omits (and N. ignores) B. v. 48. 70:

*ayudhyamāno manasā 'pi yasya jayaṁ kṛṣṇaḥ puruṣasyā
'bhinandet
evaṁ sarvān sa vyatīyād amitṛān se'ndrān devān mānuṣe
nā 'stī cintā*

So C. after 4415*a* omits (and N. ignores) B. v. 130. 51 :

ayaṁ kartā na kriyate kāraṇaṁ cā 'pi pāuruṣe
yad yad icched ayaṁ śāuris tat tat kuryād ayaṭnataḥ

These 'omissions' are additions in B. *in majorem gloriam* Kṛṣṇasya.¹

Sometimes a poetical extravagance is adorned and amplified, as when the weapon cast at him becomes a wreath on Kṛṣṇa's head. C. is content with this simple statement :

vāijayanty abhavan mālā tad astraṁ keçavo 'rasi

made in vii. (29. 19*a* =) 1274; but B. adds, 19*b*-21*a* :

padmaḥṣavicitrādḥyā sarvatrakusumotkaṭā
jvalanārṅkenduvārṇābhā pāvakojjvalapallavā
layā padmapālāçinyā vātakampūlapatrayā
çuçubhe 'bhyadhikaṁ śāurir atasīpuṣpasannibhaḥ

This is worthy of the style and vocabulary of the Purāṇas, or perhaps of the Rāmāyaṇa, as is, in fact, the whole corrupt scene with its many omissions in C. This book has any number of these amplifications. Another in vii. 73. 38-44 (extension of a curse) omitted in C. furnishes in *āsyamāithunika* (vs. 43) and *gopāneṣu ca vighnadāḥ* (vs. 42) new compounds. Pathetic embellishments are also noteworthy. In vii. 78. 16 (after 2746) omitted in C. is found the following verse: *ehy ehi tṛṣṭito vatsa stanāu pūrṇāu pibā 'çu me Aṅkam āruhya mandāyā hy atrptāyāçca darçane*, addressed to a dead man by his mother, but ridiculous on account of his age. A good example of extension in honor of the Pāṇḍavas is given by vii. 139. 19*b*-23*a*, after 5714*a*, where Bhīma dissects Karna's bows, after "he cut to pieces another bow" follows: "and a third . . . and a fourth," etc., up to eighteen !

In honor of Yudhiṣṭhira a long passage (not commented upon) after vii. 6630*a* is inserted in B. 153. 26*b*-34*a* (with repetitions from previous scenes). In the verses immediately following, C. 6634 = B. 37*c*, 38, 39*a*, or is just doubled in length (also unnoticed by N.).

Even Ghaṭotkaca's deeds are embellished with Rāmāyaṇa additions. In describing his weapon C. is content to say that it

¹ It is probably for the same reason that C. really omits (after 3333*b*) B. vi. 76. 22*b*-23, where the Devās and not Kṛṣṇa get the glory of defeating the Kurus.

was an "aṇi, Rudra-wrought, eight-wheeled, very terrible";¹ to which B. adds (vii. 175. 97):

*dviyojanasamutsedhāṁ yojanāyāmvistarām
āyasiṁ nīcitāṁ śūlāiḥ kadambam iva keṣarāiḥ*

both texts adding *viveṣa vasudhāṁ bhitvā surās tatra visismiyuḥ*. Compare Rāmāyaṇa B. i. 39. 18-23: *yojanāyāmvistarām . . . dharanītalāṁ bibhiduḥ . . . tato devāḥ . . . sambhṛāntamanasaḥ sarve*.

Amplification in honor of Śiva will be found in B. vii. 202. 16b-17a, 27a (after 9509a and 9519a) and in B. ib. 135 (after 9626). The last verse—

*bhūtaṁ bhavyaṁ bhaviṣyaṁ ca sarvaṁ jagad aṣeṣataḥ
bhava eva tato yasmād bhūtabhavyabhavodbhavaḥ*

is also omitted in N., together with 136-8. It seems to be a more modern form of vii. 201. 77.

The longest variant in the seventh book is in a Kṛṣṇa hymn, parv. 149 (where 5a = 6455). C. omits 5b-6 after 6455a; B. omits 6457a, and here (after 6456) C. omits 8b-9a, also 11-14 (after 6458); B. omits 6459-63a; C. omits 26-43 (after 6473); and B.'s 15-25 appear after 6474a. To the long interpolation, 26-43, N. gives no note at all, though profuse in explaining the verses preceding. From the omission in C. and N.'s silence on so important a passage of eighteen verses it is clear that the interpolation has been made since N.'s day. I give only a few lines of it, as it is too long to quote:

*mārkaṇḍeyaḥ purāṇarṣiḥ caritajñas tava 'nagha
māhātmyam anubhāvaṁca purā kīrtitavān munīḥ
asito devalaṣṭcāi 'va nāradaṣṭca mahātapāḥ
pitāmahaṣṭca me vyāsaś tvām āhur vidhim uttamam
. . . api devā na jānanti guhyam ādyaṁ jagatpatim
. . . jñānāyoninīṁ harīm viṣṇuṁ mumukṣūṇāṁ parāyaṇam
. . . bhavatā tapaso 'greṇa dharmeṇa paramēṇa ca
sādhutvād ārjavāc cāi 'va hataḥ pāpo jayadrathaḥ
ayaṁca puruṣavyāghra tvadanudhyānasaṁvṛtaḥ
hatvā yodhasahasrāṇi nyahan jiṣṇur jayadratham*

¹vii. 175. 96b = 7986a: *aṣṭacakrāṁ mahāghorāṁ aṇinīṁ rudranīrmitāṁ*. Even this is repeated from 156. 157 with the v. l. *aṣṭaghātāṁ . . . devanīrmitāṁ*. I have elsewhere spoken of interpolations in honor of Arjuna, Proc. Am. Or. Soc. 1888, p. v. There are several of them.

The most important omission in the seventh book is that of the half-verse 253a (after 8. 29), which B. expunges:

sa tu kṛtvā mahat karma droṇaḥ parabalārdanaḥ

The *śloka*s describing Droṇa's great act stop six verses before this. These are followed by six *triṣṭubh* verses which expand this act into others. Then the narration quietly proceeds in *śloka*s. The half-verse cited above stands just before the new beginning of *śloka*s. It is now otiose, as it has been incorporated into one of the *triṣṭubh*s: *etāni cā'nyāni ca kāuravendra karmāṇi kṛtvā samare mahātmā pratāpya lokān iva kālasūryo droṇo gataḥ svargam ito hi rājan*. The (new) *triṣṭubh* passage simply expands and adds to the preceding, changing one great act to many and prefacing the additions made in the seventh book with an (interpolated) résumé of what Droṇa did between his rout of the Pāṇḍavas and his death. B. very properly omits the half-verse in its present position, but its retention in C. is a plain indication of the fact that originally this one-half verse alone took the place of all the *triṣṭubh* verses now standing before it. Incidentally the passage shows that verses in *triṣṭubh* measure are by no means an indication of antiquity. They are often employed for pathetic effect, as they are here in preference to the slash of the *śloka*.

The same is true of the *jagatī*. Both are used occasionally to round off a scene at the end of a chapter, where interpolation is easiest. Thus, after the interpolation above in parv. 8 there is no break in the *śloka*s for nearly a thousand verses, till the end of parv. 26. Just before vs. 64 of this chapter it is related that Bhagadatta on his elephant smote the Pāṇḍavas "as a cowherd in the forest smites his cattle with his staff. Then arose among the Pandus, as they fled in haste before him, noise of fear as when an eagle quickly swoops upon a covey." To this is added (closing the chapter) in *jagatī* verse: "That lordly beast, a wingéd hill, appearing then among the foe, struck such a fear as traders feel at sight of ocean stirred and raging high around" (etc., for three verses more). Then the *śloka*s begin again and continue for a little more than one hundred verses, when at the very end of parv. 29 the great warrior is killed, and the words describing his pitiable fall appear in two *jagatīs*. Again, at the close of the next chapter, after the words: "Never twice shot he shaft at charger or man, for once was enough; one shaft and each fell,

and died of that wound," follow the languorous *jagats* describing how awful the field of battle looked with heaps of slain, and how even fathers abandoned their sons in fear of the hero. So the ghastly description of parv. 50 can be given only in *triṣṭubhs*, which begin with the third verse and continue to the end—a list of horrors.

Inversion, varied readings, and the omission of one half-verse characterize the interesting passage vii. 163. 29b–31 (the omitted half-verse, 31a, being after 7309a). I give the passage first according to B. and then according to C.

B. 29b–31.

*madhye tathānye jvalitāgniastā vyadīpayan pāṇḍusutasya
senām*

*madhye tathā'nye jvalitāgniastāḥ senādvaye 'pi sma narā
viceruḥ*

*sarveṣu sāinyeṣu padātisaṅghā vimiçritā hastirathāçva-
vrndāiḥ*

vs. 31 : *vyadīpayāns te dvajinīm pradīptās tathā balaīm pāṇḍaveyā-
bhiguptam*

*tena pradīptena tathā pradīptam balaīm tavāsīd balavad
balena*

C. 7308b–7310a.

*madhye tathā'nye jvalitapradīpāḥ senādvaye 'pi sma tadā
babhūvuh*

*sarveṣu sāinyeṣu padātisaṅghāḥ sammīçritā hastirathāçva-
vrndāiḥ*

*madhye tathā'nye jvalitāgniastā vyadīpayan pāṇḍusutasya
senām*

*tāis tu pradīpāis tu tathā pradīptam balaīm yathā 'sīd
balavad balena*

The normal measure for the whole selection (from after vs. 10 = 7289 through to 37 = 7316, the end of the chapter) is — ∪ ∪ — after the first four syllables, whether the caesura begins there or not, and the changes elsewhere in the chapter in verses 11, 12, 17 and 27 have apparently a metrical reason: in 11, C.'s *pārçvataḥ sāubalaçca* over against B.'s *kṛtavarmā sāubalaçca*; in the same verse again, C.'s *abhyadikam n°* against B.'s *gopayan vai*; in vs. 12, C.'s *pārthivān sāntva°* against B.'s *pārthiva sāntva°*; in vs.

17, B.'s *pāṇḍavāiḥ kâu°* against C.'s *pāṇḍava kâu°*; in vs. 27, B.'s *te 'pi cakruḥ pra°* against C.'s *te 'pi ca cakr°*. One MS, according to Roy, in vs. 17 reads *kāuravayodhavarḡāiḥ* instead of *pāṇḍavāiḥ kāuraveyāiḥ* of B., or *pāṇḍavakāuraveyāiḥ* in C., which makes both metre and sense conform to the rest (as the Pāṇḍavas do not really light their lamps till vs. 27). Four examples in the whole list of one hundred fail to conform to the scheme — ∪ ∪ — in either text: *bhāskarasyā°* in 26 = 7305; *pr̥thivīm ant°¹* in 32 = 7311; *divyakalpam* in 35 = 7313; *pāṇḍavān vipr°* in 37 = 7316. Since these have been allowed to remain it would perhaps be too much to suppose that the half-verse 31a has been omitted on account of the intractable *pāṇḍaveyā°*, though it would not be impossible. There seems, however, in this section to be at work a uniforming rhetoric tendency which may have to be reckoned with in solving the question of final redaction.

But I have already said enough to show that the Mahābhārata cannot be regarded as having originally existed in its present form. Any one who holds this view would have to explain by what accident the seemingly latest books are those which the text itself inferentially repudiates; and by what accident so many omissions and additions are full of significance. To one that takes the historical view that the epic has grown, that, as Greek and native testimony show in combination, there was once a real but small epic, all the facts presented by the text are intelligible.

Against this Dahlmann urges the antiquity of the great didactic parts. But this does not prove them (even if their antiquity be admitted) to have been original parts of the epic. Nor does the mass of his detailed arguments prove any more for the Mahābhārata than the same detailed arguments would prove when applied to the Harivaṅṣa or to some of the Purāṇas. The Śānti and Anuśāsana cannot be shown to belong to the fifth century B. C. on the strength of likeness with customs of that century, for we have no literature so sure of date as to prove the point; and what exterior evidence we possess does not substantiate Dahlmann's view. He speaks of the grand palaces described in

¹ This is a common form (but not constant) in the hymn at vii. 201. 77: *bhūtaṁ bhavyaṁ bhavitā cāpyadhṛṣyam* (C. *cāpradhṛṣyam*), *tvat saṁbhūtā bhuvanānīha viśvā*, *bhaktāṁ ca mān bhajamānaṁ bhajasva*, *mā rīriṣo mām ahitāhitena* (C. *mamāhitā*). *ātmanāṁ tvām ātmano naryabodhaṁ* ('*nanyabhāvam*'), *vidvān evaṁ gacchati brahmaçukram*; *astāṁṣaṁ tvāṁ tavasaṁmānam icchan vicinvan vāi sadṛçaṁ devavarya*, *sudurlabhān dehi varān mameṣṭān abhiṣṭutāḥ pravikārṣiça māyām*. On the Vedic forms see J. A. O. S. XVII, p. 25.

parts of the epic (the account of heavenly palaces obtruded into the Sabhā, the didactic descriptions of the same in *Çānti*, the embellished accounts elsewhere in epic or *Rāmāyaṇa* art-poetry); and says: "Look at the remains from Mathurā, read the *Jātakas*. Do not these prove a high antiquity for native (epic) architecture?" No. For the *Jātakas* allude chiefly to wooden architecture, and Mathurā stone-work is Hellenized, nor is it referable to so early a period. Then, on the other hand, I think of the first Greek report that all the Hindu houses are made of wood, mud, or brick; and wonder whether the magnificent buildings described in the *Mahābhārata* escaped the stranger's notice or whether they did not then exist: withal two centuries after Dahlmann's date.

But I promised to say only a few words. And, after all, one sufficient argument against Dahlmann is that there is epic power and epic beauty in the *Mahābhārata*. I do not see how any one can read it through and not recognize that the savage strength and poetic aroma of certain scenes never could have been pedagogic accessories of a moral. Even Dahlmann, however, admits that "old tales" formed the background of his monster manual. But to say just when the old tale of the epic proper was so altered as to make it chiefly didactic is impossible. Dahlmann thinks it was an ictic conversion, but against this view stand both the a priori improbability of any one man performing a series of tasks so incongruous, and the evidence of the extant text.

As regards the place and time of the final redaction, it may be said in general that as the epic part of the *Mahābhārata* deals with the Holy Land, so the early epic account shows familiarity with the customs of the adjacent *Puñjab*, while the didactic portion, as, for instance, in *Çānti*, shows no familiarity with the Holy Land, and all its numerous tales, with scarcely an exception, are laid in *Kosala* and *Videha* and on the banks of the lower *Ganges*. Thus in parv. 18, the discourse of the king of *Videha* and his *Kosala* wife; in 28, that of *Açman* and the *Videha* king; in 82, another *Kosala* tale; in 99, a *Mithilā* tale; in 104, a *Kosala* tale; in 122, an *Aṅga* tale; in 153, a *Nāimiṣa* tale; in 277, a *Videha* tale; in 354, a tale of a town south of the *Ganges*; in 356, a tale of the *Nāga* town on the *Gomati* (in *Nāimiṣa*), etc. To offset these there is only a discourse referred to *Çatruñjaya* (*Sauvīra*) in 140; *Kāmpilya*, *Pāñcāla*, in 139; and the story of a

brāhmaṇo madhyadeśīyaḥ, who had an adventure "among the Mlecchas in the north country," 168. 29. The Himavat furnishes a parable in 154, and *Paippalādi* (*sa Kāuṣikāḥ, himavatpāda-saṁśayaḥ*), in 199, may betray acquaintance with Kashmir Atharvanists. But the run of the tales would certainly suggest that the author of *Çānti* was more familiar with the east than with the west. I may add that the original *Dānadharma* seems to be extant in xii. 235, and that *Vyāsa* in xii. 350. 10 has completed the (whole) *Mahābhārata* and is resting after his labor. The *Mahābhāratakṛt* is really *Viṣṇu* (xii. 347. 12; 350. 58).

The time of the final redaction may now be estimated within three or four centuries. It is certainly after the Hindus built well in stone and after the Greeks were familiar to them; when, too, the "temples of the gods" had been replaced by the *edukas* of the Buddhists, certainly not before the third century B. C. On the other hand, when it is remembered that our extant engraved deeds of land go back to the fourth century and that the *tāmra-paṭṭa* is mentioned as early as the second or third century A. D., it seems possible to set an earlier date for the terminus ad quem than has hitherto been attempted. Professor Bhandarkar has shown how early the *Mahābhārata* was cited, and Professor Bühler has drawn the conclusion that it must have been known as a *Smṛti* as early as 400, perhaps 300, A. D. Now, when one considers with what hysterical unscrupulousness the author of the Gift-law insists on the king's duty of giving land to priests, how he iterates the spiritual advantages, and tells the king just what he ought to give, and when and how he ought to give land, it seems highly improbable that, had the author been acquainted with the custom of securing such a gift by means of a written or engraved deed, he should have failed to mention it and describe it, if not as explicitly as *Bṛhaspati*, at least as curtly as *Yājñavalkya*. But there is not an intimation anywhere in the *Mahābhārata* that such a gift-deed was known, although writing is common and even rock-inscriptions are mentioned. Moreover, 'gifts of land' by no means imply a deeded *agrahāra*, as does a copper-plate deed, and, in fact, the *agrahāra* is mentioned very rarely, and in one of the cases it does not mean a land-grant, but a (first) gift of food (the older sense), while a *grāmāgrahāra* is mentioned but once.¹ As we may be quite sure from legal

¹ No *paṭa*, *paṭṭa*, *lekhyā*, or *çāsana* is mentioned in connection with any *agrahāra* or *bhūmidāna*.

testimony that the formal deed of land, written or engraved on cloth or copper, was known as early as 200 A. D., we are tolerably safe in assuming that the land-gift chapter of Anuṣāsaṇa, which as I have shown is a late part of the epic, is itself anterior to this date. It is, furthermore, interesting to notice that the verses in the inscriptions which are assigned to Vyāsa, to Manu, to 'old seers,' and to the Mahābhārata (but this last not before the end of the fifth century), are chiefly forgeries, to judge by our present text. That is to say, they are an enlargement and intensification of the verses in the epic, to fit them to the need of a land-grant. The inscriptions themselves show that the earlier quotations are after the manner of the older Manu-quotations; in other words, there was no received text. Almost every one of them is read in two or three different ways, and not one of them corresponds exactly to an epic verse. But the gist of them is given in

- xiii. 62. 74: *pūrvadattām haran bhūmiṃ narakāyo 'pagacchati*
 ib. 4: *na bhūmidānād astiha paraṃ kiñcid, Yudhiṣṭhira*
 ib. 78: *nā 'cchindyāt śparṣitām bhūmiṃ pareṇa (= dattām)*
 ib. 83: *loke mahīyate sadbhīr yo dadāti vasundharām*
 ib. 87: *modate ca sukham svarge*
 ib. 84. 41: *gāṣ ca bhūmiṃ ca vittam ca dattve 'ha bhr̥gunandana*
pāpakṛt pūyate martya iti bhārgava ṣuṣṛuma
 xii. 33. 44: *paripāhi vasundharām (Vyāsa to Yudhiṣṭhira)*

The 'sixty thousand years' verse has quite a different application than that given in the inscriptions, xiii. 125. 78 and 106. 48; as has the *puriṣam bhuñjate* verse, xii. 26. 29. It is curious, too, that Sagara does not head the list of meritorious kings, as he does in the inscriptions, but stands far down and is famous as a giver not of land, but of a "golden palace," xii. 29. 130. The *bhūmida* is assured of release from all sin, but not in the words of the inscriptions, xiii. 62. 37, 59 ff. It is remarkable that in the list of hell-doomed sinners at xiii. 23. 60 ff. appears only a general 'thief'; nor do the winners of heaven include the giver of a village, the typical *bhūmida*, but only of a house and field. This passage shows how easily the word *Yudhiṣṭhira* is used to round off a couplet. In the last forty verses it occurs six times; but no such verse as

svadattām paradattām vā yatnād rakṣa yudhiṣṭhira

is found in the epic, though the inscriptions ascribe it, sometimes without the tag and sometimes with a different beginning, to 'an old seer,' to Vyāsa, and at last, scarcely before the sixth century, to the Mahābhārata.

As was to be expected, the later inscriptions citing the epic by name offer the closest parallels. Thus, they say

*prāyeṇa hi narendrāṇāṃ vidyate na śubhā gatīḥ
pūyante te tu satataṃ prayacchanto vasundharām*

while the epic says :

xiii. 84. 2-3: *bhūyiṣṭhaṃca narendrāṇāṃ vidyate na śubhā gatīḥ
pūyante tatra niyataṃ prayacchanto vasundharām*

The lower limit of the completed epic must be adjusted to the fact that the Ādi table and Svargārohaṇa both mention the Hari-vaṇṇa, and the Hari-vaṇṇa mentions the foreign denarius, which is not found in the epic proper, though the native *niṣka* is frequently mentioned as a coin. This, too, would appear to indicate that the epic was practically finished before the second century A. D.

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS.